



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/577,909	05/24/2000	Gabriel J. Hall	13237-2615/ MS#149405.1	4482

27488 7590 10/03/2003

MERCHANT & GOULD
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

ENGLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2003

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

7

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/577,909

Applicant(s)

HALL ET AL.

Examiner

David E. England

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 35 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 16 – 20, 22 – 24 and 27 – 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mantha et al. U.S. Patent No. 6163779 (hereinafter Mantha).

3. Referencing claim 10, Mantha teaches a method for automatically attaching a web page as a single file to an email note, the method comprising the steps of:

4. determining that a user desires to attach a selected file to the email note, (e.g. col. 8, line 1 – col. 9, line 37);

5. determining whether the selected file is a web page, (e.g. col. 8, line 1 – col. 9, line 37);

6. in response to a determination that the selected file is a web page, determining whether the selected file includes at least one link to at least one resource file, (e.g. col. 8, line 15 – col. 9, line 14 & col. 10, lines 16 – 39 & col. 11, line 4 – col. 12, line 56); and

Art Unit: 2143

7. in response to a determination that the selected file includes at least one link to at least one resource file, determining whether automatic attachment of the at least one resource file has been authorized, (e.g. col. 11, line 4 – col. 12, line 56 & col. 13, lines 33 - 48); and

8. in response to a determination that automatic attachment of the at least one resource file has been authorized, packaging the selected file and the at least one resource file into a single attachment file and attaching the attachment file to the email note, (e.g. col. 8, line 15 – col. 9, line 14 & col. 13, lines 33 - 48).

9. Referencing claim 12, Mantha teaches the step of determining that a user desires to attach a file to the email note comprises determining that a user has inserted the selected file into the email note, (e.g. col. 11, line 4 – col. 12, line 56 & col. 13, lines 33 - 48).

10. Referencing claim 13, Mantha teaches the step of determining that a user desires to attach a file to the email note comprises determining that a user has copied the selected file into the email note, (e.g. col. 11, line 4 – col. 12, line 56 & col. 13, lines 33 - 48).

11. Referencing claim 16, Mantha teaches the step of determining that the selected file includes at least one link to at least one resource file comprises determining whether the selected file includes a tag including the string: <link rel=FileList href=>, (e.g. col. 10, line 16 – col. 12, line 35).

Art Unit: 2143

12. Referencing claim 17, Mantha teaches the step of determining that the selected file includes at least one link to at least one resource file comprises determining whether the selected file includes a link tag selected from the group of:

- 13. ;
- 14. ;
- 15. ;
- 16. <body background=>;
- 17. <script src=>;
- 18. <bgsound src=>;
- 19. <embed src=>; and
- 20. <link rel="stylesheet">, (e.g. col. 9, line 50 – col. 12, line 35).

21. Referencing claim 18, Mantha teaches the step of determining whether automatic attachment of the at least one resource file has been authorized comprises determining the status of at least one registry key, (e.g. col. 10, line 16 – col. 12, line 47 & col. 13, lines 33 – 48).

22. Referencing claim 19, Mantha teaches the step of determining the status of at least one registry key comprises determining the status of a web page packing registry key, (e.g. col. 10, line 16 – col. 12, line 47 & col. 13, lines 33 – 48).

Art Unit: 2143

23. Referencing claim 20, Mantha the step of determining the status of at least one registry key comprises determining the status of an automatic packing registry key, (e.g. col. 10, line 16 – col. 12, line 47 & col. 13, lines 33 – 48).

24. Referencing claim 30, Mantha teaches determining whether automatic attachment of resource files for the web page has been authorized, (e.g. col. 8, line 15 – col. 9, line 14 & col. 13, lines 33 – 48).

25. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 22 – 24, 27 – 29 and 31 – 35 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

26. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

27. Claims 2, 11, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mantha (6163779) in view of Borman et al. (6226655) (hereinafter Borman).

28. As per claim 11, Mantha does not specifically teach the step of determining that a user desires to attach a file to the email note comprises determining that a user has dragged the

Art Unit: 2143

selected file into the email note. Borman teaches the step of determining that a user desires to attach a file to the email note comprises determining that a user has dragged the selected file into the email note, (e.g. col. 12, line 62 – col. 13, line 17). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Borman with Mantha because it would be more convenient for a user to utilize a common function, (i.e. “drag & drop”), to copy or relocate a file as apposed to typing a command to do the same function, (i.e. using a DOS prompt).

29. Claims 2 and 26 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

30. Claims 5, 6, 14, 15, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mantha (6163779) in view of Gupta et al. (6519646) (hereinafter Gupta).

31. As per claim 14, Mantha does not specifically teach the step of determining that the selected file is a web page comprises determining whether the selected file has an ".htm" extension. Gupta teaches the step of determining that the selected file is a web page comprises determining whether the selected file has an ".htm" extension, (e.g. col. 4, lines 45 – 59). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gupta with Mantha because it would be more efficient for a system to know the difference between a web page file that could be a potential link to another web page or an object that is just a picture or a link to another part of the web page that does not take a user to a different web

Art Unit: 2143

page file. This could be used to save different parts of a web page in different directories/folders.

32. As per claim 15, Mantha does not specifically teach the step of determining that the selected file is a web page comprises determining whether the selected file has an ".html" extension. Gupta teaches the step of determining that the selected file is a web page comprises determining whether the selected file has an ".html" extension, (e.g. col. 4, lines 45 – 59). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Borman with Mantha because of similar reasons as stated above.

33. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

34. Claims 9, 21, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mantha (6163779) in view of Gabbard et al. (6205432) (hereinafter Gabbard).

35. As per claim 21, Mantha teaches all that is similar and described above but does not specifically teach converting the selected file and the at least one resource file into an MHTML file. Gabbard teaches converting the selected file and the at least one resource file into an MHTML file, (e.g. col. 11, line 65 – col. 13, line 17). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gabbard with Mantha because it would be more efficient for a system to utilize a common protocol such as Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions HTML, (i.e. MINE-HTML or MHTML). This protocol enables the system to more

Art Unit: 2143

efficiently send and receive graphics, audio, and video files via the Internet mail system.

Furthermore, MIME was defined in 1992 by the IETF.

36. Claims 9 and 25 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Response to Arguments

37. Applicant's arguments filed 07/23/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

38. In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that states Mantha does not teach packing of a single attachment file containing the web page file and its resource files; packing only occurs in response to the determination that the selected file has at least one link to a resource file and to the determination that the selected file is a web page; another determination in the combination of determinations is a determination that the attachment of the resource file is authorized.

39. As to part 1, Examiner would like to draw the Applicant's attention to the restated rejection filed 04/23/2003 and the further citing of the presented prior art that should clarify the teachings of Mantha. In the above-cited reference of claim 10, Mantha teaches packing of a single attachment file containing the web page file and its resource files. Quoting Mantha, "The file directory (for the copied pages (e.g. c:\user\copies\c1\c1.htm, i1.jpg, etc.)) is self-contained

Art Unit: 2143

and needs no other files or system dependent information to view the copied page. As a result, the invention may be used with an e-mail application to simplify the transfer of the saved Web page. In particular, the user simply attaches a copy of the directory contents to the e-mail and all embedded files get transferred." This is found in column 13, lines 40 – 47 in Mantha. If the Applicant would look at the example they would notice that it is one directory with multiple resource files in the directory. Further proof of this can be found in the cited areas stated the rejection of claim 10.

40. Mantha also teaches packing only occurs in response to the determination that the selected file has at least one link to a resource file and to the determination that the selected file is a web page, and a determination that the attachment of the resource file is authorized, as restated above and further clarified. To quote Mantha, "The box also includes a Type request field that is clicked by the user to indicate that a "copy of a page" is desired." "At step 35, the user clicks DONE to initiate the copy (e.g. col. 8, lines 56 – 61). Linked list 74 (LL1) is a linked list of URLs in the original file, and this list is preferably created in the order of the links as they appear from the beginning of the file, (e.g. col. 10, lines 22 – 25). Each entry of the first linked list is preferably added to a back of the list. Thereafter, and for each hypertext reference in the first linked list, the following operations are performed. If the hypertext reference refers to an embedded object in the base HTML document, the embedded object is saved on the client local storage and the file name of the saved embedded object is stored (as a fully-qualified URL) in a second linked list, (e.g. col. 12, lines 15 – 22)." Mantha does teach authenticating the files and determining that the selected file is a web page with at least one link.

Art Unit: 2143

41. Other areas of the cited reference can also clarify the limitations stated above.

Furthermore, these quoted sections should not in any way hinder the prior art in just these areas since these cited areas are just a sample of the areas that are referred to in the action.

42. In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that states Mantha does not teach packing a web page and a resource file into a single file or, in this particular case, a single web archive file.

43. As to part 2, the Examiner would like to draw the Applicant's attention to part 1 of the response to arguments, where it is stated above that Mantha does teach packing a web page and a resource file into a single file or, in this particular case, a single web archive file.

44. In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that states Borman does not fill any of the deficiencies discussed above regarding the Mantha reference relative to claim 1.

45. As to part 3, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

46. In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that states Gupta does not satisfy any of the deficiencies of the Mantha reference as discussed above for claim 1.

Art Unit: 2143

47. As to part 4, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

48. In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that states Gabbard does not teach packing a web page and all of its resource files into a single attachment file.

49. As to part 4, Examiner would like to draw the Applicant's attention to the independent claims of the application and the cited rejections that are associated in the independent claims. Mantha teaches this deficiency as stated and restated above and therefore are still covered in the dependent claims that rely on the independent claims of the application. The reference of Gabbard was to address the lacking limitation of converting the files and the at least one resource file into an MHTML file which is stated above and further clarified by the Examiner as to the specific limitation Gabbard teaches.

Conclusion

50. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2143

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


51. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 703-305-5333. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are none for regular communications and none for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is none.

David E. England
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

De 
September 29, 2003


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100